



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/690,686	10/22/2003	Rama K.T. Akkiraju	GB920030072US1	6118
48915 7590 07/06/2007 CANTOR COLBURN LLP-IBM YORKTOWN 55 GRIFFIN ROAD SOUTH BLOOMFIELD, CT 06002			EXAMINER WINTER, JOHN M	
			ART UNIT 3621	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 07/06/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/690,686	Applicant(s) AKKIRAJU ET AL.	
	Examiner John M. Winter	Art Unit 3621	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 April 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5,8-12,15-19 and 22-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4,5,8,9,11,12,15,16,18,19,22,23,25 and 26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 3, 10, 17 and 24 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Acknowledgements

The Applicant's amendment filed on April 10, 2007 is acknowledged, Claims 1-5, 8-12, 15-19 and 22-26 remain pending .

Response to Arguments

The Applicants arguments filed on April 10, 2007 have been fully considered.

The amended claims are rejected in view of Nykänen (US Patent 7,155,425) in view of Fletcher et al. (US Patent 6,985,939).

See following rejection .

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-2,4,5, 8-9,11,12, 15-16, 18,19 and 22-23, 25, 26 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nykänen (US Patent 7,155,425) in view of Fletcher et al. (US Patent 6,985,939).

As per claim 1

Nykänen ('425) discloses a data processing method for a UDDI registry to enable location of details of services which match service requester requirements, the method of the UDDI registry comprising the steps:

receiving a standard UDDI request to locate service details, the request comprising details of a tModel which defines service requirements specified in a particular language;(Column 7, line 45—column 8 line 42)

locating details of at least one service, the details comprising a tModel which defines service capabilities specified in the particular language;(Column 7, line 45—column 8 line 42)

Nykänen ('425) does not explicitly disclose selecting from a plurality of external matching services an external matching service which is capable of comparing the service requirements and service capabilities, wherein each external matching service is accessed through an interface defined in an interface tModel; and using the external matching service to filter the located details to find those with indicated service capabilities which match the service requirements.

. Fletcher et al. ('939) discloses selecting from a plurality of external matching services an external matching service which is capable of comparing the service requirements and service capabilities, wherein each external matching service is accessed through an interface defined in an interface tModel; and using the external matching service to filter the located details to find those with indicated service capabilities which match the service requirements. (Column 7, lines 15-54) It would be obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the Nykänen ('425) method with the Fletcher et al. ('939) method in order to optimize the content of a web portal..

Art Unit: 3621

Claims 8,15 and 22 are in parallel with claim 1 and are rejected for at least the same reasons

As per claim 2

Nykänen ('425)) discloses the method of claim 1 wherein the standard UDDI request further comprises service requirements specified in a standard UDDI category, the method comprising the further step of:

finding details of at least one service, the details defining service capabilities which match the service requirements specified in a standard UDDI category; wherein the locating step locates details of at least one service from those found by the finding step.(Column 7, line 45—column 8 line 42)

Claims 9,16 and 23 are in parallel with claim 2 and are rejected for at least the same reasons

As per claim 4

Nykänen ('425)) discloses the method of claim 1 wherein the standard UDDI request is a find_tModel request (Figure 4B)

Claims 11, 18 and 25 are in parallel with claim 4 and are rejected for at least the same reasons

As per claim 5

Art Unit: 3621

Nykänen ('425)) discloses the method of claim 1

Official Notice is taken that “the particular language is one of DAML-S, UML, and WSDL.” is common and well known in prior art in reference to object modeling. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize an object modeling protocol in order to model objects

Claims 12, 19 and 26 are in parallel with claim 5 and are rejected for at least the same reasons

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 3, 10, 17 and 24 objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

Examiners note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the examiner.

Also in accordance with *In re Lee*, 277 F.3d 1338, 1344-45, 61 USPQ2d 1430, 1434-35 (Fed. Cir. 2002), the Examiner finds that Nathan J. Muller’s Desktop Encyclopedia of the

Art Unit: 3621

Internet, (“Desktop Encyclopedia”) is additional evidence of what is basic knowledge or common sense to one of ordinary skill in this art. Muller’s Desktop Encyclopedia is a practical reference that clearly explains Internet services, applications, protocols, access methods, development tools, administration and management, standards, and regulations. Because of the reference’s basic content (which is self-evident upon examination of the reference) and after further review of the entire record including the prior art now of record in conjunction with the factors as discussed in MPEP §2141.03 (where practical), the Examiner finds that the Desktop Encyclopedia is primarily directed towards those of low skill in this art. Because the reference is directed towards those of low skill in this art, the Examiner finds that one of ordinary skill in this art must—at the very least—be aware of and understand the knowledge and information contained within the Desktop Encyclopedia.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John M. Winter whose telephone number is (571) 272-6713. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-6, 1st Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner’s supervisor, Andrew Fischer can be reached on (571) 272-6779. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3621

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



John Winter
Patent Examiner -- 3621



ANDREW J. FISCHER
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600